

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-18, 20-30, 32-36 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 4 and 31 were previously cancelled, claim 19 is presently cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 14-18, 20-24, 28, and 32-36 are presently amended. The amendments do not introduce new matter and are fully supported by the specification as filed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-20, 24-30, 32-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-20, 24-30 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al. (6,582,475) hereinafter “Graham”, in view of Stern (US PG Pub. No. 2003/0038840) hereinafter “Stern”. Applicants’ representative respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants’ claimed invention relates to systems and methods for conveying user information between and among users and allows user profile building to occur coincident with, for example, user browsing of electronic data sources (*e.g.*, web pages, among others). In particular, independent claims 1, 16, 28, 32, 33, 35 and 36 recite “user selectable semantic-centric input features that automatically present a user with an annotation based, at least in part, on one or more datum related to a user and, at least in part, reflects a context of the current computer-based interaction, *such that selection of a user selectable semantic-centric input feature is an assertion of the related automatically presented annotation regarding user perceptions about the current computer-based interaction*”, or similar language. Applicants’ representative asserts that it is clear from the specification that the claimed semantic-centric input feature is a selectable feature such as, for example, a user interface button. Moreover, this exemplary button can display an annotation corresponding to user-perceptions about the current computer-based interaction as claimed, for example, a button annotated to reflect that the user likes or does not like the content of a currently viewed web page. Neither Graham nor Stern, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest these novel aspects of the claimed subject matter.

As previously stated, Graham relates to an automatic printing assistant that can select portions of documents of particular interest to the user for printing but requires the user to enter

concepts and subconcepts to facilitate the selection of the portions of interest. (*See, e.g.,* Graham paragraph [0059].) Graham is silent with regard to “user selectable semantic-centric input features that *automatically present[s] a user with an annotation* based, at least in part, on one or more datum related to a user and, at least in part, reflects a context of the current computer-based interaction, *such that selection of a user selectable semantic-centric input feature is an assertion of the related automatically presented annotation regarding user perceptions about the current computer-based interaction*” (emphasis added), as explicitly claimed in claim 1. Graham merely allows users to manually enter terms that are used to search portions of documents to determine which portions are relevant for printing purposes. This cannot be deemed to disclose or suggest automatic generation of annotations to reflect user perceptions about a computer based interaction. Stern does not cure this defect.

Stern generally describes a system that can track a user’s actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some manner. More specifically, Stern at [0055] describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, “The system will then automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the user’s profile accordingly.” (Emphasis added.) Similarly, “The system will extract such information and update the user’s intelligent profile accordingly. In this way, the user’s profile will contain parameters relating to [a topic], even though the user neither input such parameters directly nor interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic.” (*Id.*, emphasis added.) Stern explicitly teaches away from “*user selectable semantic-centric input features that automatically present[s] a user with an annotation based, at least in part, on one or more datum related to a user and, at least in part, reflects a context of the current computer-based interaction, such that selection of a user selectable semantic-centric input feature is an assertion of the related automatically presented annotation regarding user perceptions about the current computer-based interaction*” (emphasis added), as explicitly claimed in claim 1.

Whereas Graham does not disclose or suggest these aspects of the claimed subject matter and Stern teaches away from these aspects of the claimed subject matter, no combination of Graham and Stern will server to obviate the claimed subject matter. As such, independent claims 1, 16, 28, 32, 33, 35 and 36 are patentable over the cited reference as follows:

Claim 1 and dependant claims:

With regard to amended claim 1, Graham and Stern, either alone or in combination do not disclose “user selectable semantic-centric input features that automatically present a user with an annotation based, at least in part, on one or more datum related to a user and, at least in part, reflects a context of the current computer-based interaction, such that selection of a user selectable semantic-centric input feature is an assertion of the related automatically presented annotation regarding user perceptions about the current computer-based interaction” (emphasis added), as explicitly claimed in claim 1. Graham is silent in regard to this aspect and Stern teaches away from this aspect of the claimed subject matter, as asserted *supra*. Additionally, for the same reasons, applicants’ representative submits that claims 2, 3, and 5-15 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 1. Therefore, based on the above remarks, applicants’ representative respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-15 under 35 USC § 103(a) in view of Graham in further view of Stern be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Moreover, claim 5 states “the semantic-centric input features respectively are UI buttons.” Neither Graham nor Stern discloses this aspect of the claimed subject matter. A “concept add button” (as in Graham) is not a semantic-centric input feature as claimed because it does not possess the claimed functionality (being automatically annotated...*such that selection of a user selectable semantic-centric input feature is an assertion of the related automatically presented annotation regarding user perceptions about the current computer-based interaction*). For at least this reason, claim 5 is separately allowable over the cited art.

With regard to claim 12, a “privacy-preserving searching component” is not disclosed in Graham. Firstly, Graham is silent with regard to preserving privacy and merely discloses a security password feature. A security feature, like a password, does not protect the privacy of a searchable user profiles and merely restricts full access to parties with the password. Secondly, the feature disclosed in Graham does not disclose searching for other users “by similar profile” as claimed. Graham merely states that a profile can be personalized to a particular user or group of users. This is not equivalent to allowing searching for similar profiles. For at least these additional reasons, claim 12 is believed to be separately patentable.

Claim 16 and dependant claims:

With regard to claim 16, Graham and Stern, either alone or in combination do not suggest or disclose “the input component comprising a plurality of user selectable semantic-centric input features that automatically display an annotation based, at least in part, on one or more datum related to a user and further reflect a context of the current computer-based interaction, such that selection of an input feature is an assertion of the corresponding annotation regarding a user’s perceptions about the current computer-based interaction”, as explicitly presented in claim 16. Graham is silent in regard to this aspect and Stern teaches away from this aspect of the claimed subject matter, as asserted *supra*. Additionally, for the same reasons, applicants’ representative submits that claims 17-18, 20 and 24-27 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 16. Therefore, based on the above remarks, the applicants’ representative respectfully request that the rejection of claims 16-18, 20 and 24-27 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious in light of Graham in view of Stern be withdrawn.

Claim 28 and dependant claims:

Claim 28 is directed to a method that “selecting one or more of a plurality of semantic-centric input features that automatically present a user with an annotation based, at least in part, on one or more datum related to a user and, at least in part, reflect context of at least a portion of the stored information, wherein a selection of a user selectable semantic-centric input feature is an assertion of the related automatically presented annotation correlating with user perceptions about the current computer-based interaction”. Both Graham and Stern are silent with regard to this aspect, as asserted *supra*. Additionally, for the same reasons, applicants’ representative submits that claims 29 and 30 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 28. Therefore, based on the above remarks, the applicants’ representative respectfully request that the rejection of claims 28-30 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Graham in further view of Stern be withdrawn.

Claim 32, 33, 35, 36 and dependant claims:

With regard to claim 32, as asserted *supra*, Graham and Stern are silent as to a, “plurality of semantic-centric input interface features that can automatically display annotations that reflect a context of a then current computer-based interaction and are based at least in part on a datum

related to the user, such that user annotations regarding user perceptions about a current computer-based interaction are accessed by selecting one or more of the input interface features” as claimed. Again, Graham and Stern are silent as to this aspect of the claimed subject matter. As such, claim 32 is believed to be allowable.

Similarly, claim 33 recites, “the input components comprising a plurality of semantic-centric input interface features that automatically generate and display annotations that are, at least in part, based on one or more datum related to the user and further reflect a context of the current computer-based interaction, such that at least one user annotation regarding a user’s perceptions about a current computer-based interaction is selectable”. As asserted *supra*, Graham and Stern are silent as to these aspects. Thus, claim 33 is allowable over any combination of Graham and Stern. For the same reasons, applicants’ representative submits that claim 34 is allowable, as this claim depends from claim 33.

As to claim 35, Graham and Stern do not disclose or suggest, “a plurality of semantic-centric input features that automatically present an annotation based, at least in part, on one or more datum related to a user and, at least in part, reflect a context of at least a portion of the stored information, wherein a selection of a user selectable semantic-centric input feature is an assertion of the related automatically presented annotation correlating to user perceptions about the portion of the information being browsed”, as asserted *supra*. Similarly, claim 35 is believed to be non-obvious and allowable.

Claim 36 asserts, “a plurality of semantic-centric_user-interface input features that automatically generate and present annotations that reflect potential user perceptions about the current computer-based interaction, the annotations, at least in part, reflect both the history of the user and the context of the current computer-based interaction, such that selection of a semantic-centric user-interface input features asserts the displayed potential user perception represented by the displayed annotations...wherein the potential_user perceptions at least in part relate to at least one of an emotional response of the user, an experience of the user, a desire of the user, a philosophy of the user, a preference of the user, a goal of the user, an opinion of the user, relevance to the user, a theology of the user, an insight of the user, and a conception of the user”. These aspects are not disclosed or suggested in either Graham or Stern, as asserted *supra*. Moreover, neither Graham nor Stern disclose or suggest the *enumerated specific* relatedness of the potential user perceptions as claimed. Claim 36 is believed to be allowable over either

Graham or Stern, either alone or in combination.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, the applicants' representative respectfully request that the rejection of claims 32-24 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obviated by Graham in view of Stern be withdrawn

II. Rejection of Claims 21-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham, in view of Stern in further view of Wolpe (US PG Pub. No. 2002/0174144) hereinafter "Wolpe". Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees for at least the following reason. Independent claim 16, from which claims 21-23 depend, is believed to be allowable over Graham and Stern, either alone or in combination, as asserted *supra*. Wolpe does not correct these deficiencies and simply discloses suggesting substitute words as a user enters text. Thus, the rejection of dependant claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is obviated and applicants' representative respectfully request that the rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Graham in view of Stern in further view of Wolpe be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP477US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Frank J Schumacher IV/

Frank J Schumacher IV

Reg. No. 61,292

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (425) 256-8302
Facsimile (216) 696-8731